

20 Church Street Hartford, CT 06103 Telephone: 860-525-5065 Fax: 860-527-4198 www.lockelord.com

David W. Bogan Partner Direct Telephone: 860-541-7711 Direct Fax: 866-877-2145 david.bogan@lockelord.com

November 27, 2017

VIA ELECTRONIC MAIL AND FIRST CLASS MAIL

Melanie A. Bachman Acting Executive Director Connecticut Siting Council 10 Franklin Square New Britain, CT 06051

Re: Petition 1310 – Quinebaug Solar, LLC petition for a declaratory ruling that no Certificate of Environmental Compatibility and Public Need is required for the proposed construction, maintenance and operation of a 50 megawatt AC solar photovoltaic electric generating facility on approximately 561 acres comprised of 29 separate and abutting privately-owned parcels located generally north of Wauregan Road in Canterbury and south of Rukstela Road and Allen Hill Road in Brooklyn, Connecticut.

Dear Ms. Bachman:

I am writing on behalf of Quinebaug Solar, LLC ("Quinebaug") relative to the Connecticut Siting Council's (the "Council's") November 13, 2017 draft Findings of Fact in response to Quinebaug's petition for a declaratory ruling by that no certificate of environmental compatibility and public need is required for the above-referenced proposed solar project (the "Project"). The Council asked parties to identify errors or inconsistencies between the Council's draft findings of fact and the record.

The Petitioner believes the draft Findings of Fact are by and large accurate. However, the Petitioner respectfully offers the following suggested revisions and additions:

- QS is a Delaware Limited Liability Company, wholly owned by NextEra <u>Energy</u> Resources, LLC (<u>NEER</u>), a subsidiary of NextEra <u>Energy</u>, <u>Inc.</u>, with headquarters at 700 Universe Blvd., Juno Beach, Florida. QS was previously an affiliate of Ranger Solar, LLC (Ranger Solar) of Yarmouth, Maine. Ranger Solar was acquired by <u>NEER</u> in early 2017. (QS 1, p. 2-1)
- 86. The proposed site is the only site QS was able to secure that <u>could</u> is <u>capable</u> of <u>accommodatinge a project of this size</u>, and hasd both willing landowners and close proximity to existing electrical infrastructure. (Tr. 3, p. 9)

- 190. During vernal pool surveys, the Petitioner's consultant spent between 19 and 40 minutes in each of five vernal pools depending on vernal pool size, and abundance and diversity of fauna observed. The average time in each pool was 27 minutes. Survey techniques included wading through pools, visual observation and dipnetting in the vernal pools. (QS 5, response 91)
- 191. Potential vernal pools were identified through following meandering transect surveys utilizing a GPS in a grid-like pattern throughout the entirety of the project site. (QS 5, response 94; Tr. 3, p. 50)
- 198. Vernal pool surveys that were conducted in 2016 focused on identifying the locations of vernal pools on the properties rather than and determining the presence of biota-k in the vernal pools. (Tr. 3, p. 58)
- 269. Of the approximately The Council received two written limited appearance statements in favor of the proposed facility, concerns include, but are not limited to, the following which noted the following project benefits:
 - cleaner source of energy;
 - reducing GHG emissions; and
 - tax revenue.

(Tr. 2; Public Comment Record)

The Petitioner also requests that the Council incorporate one additional Finding of Fact in order to accurately reflect the record related to draft Finding of Fact 33.

"On August 1, 2017, the Petitioner submitted comments in response to DoAg's correspondence, which included, but was not limited to the following:

- a) The Petitioner responded to DoAg's discussion of Public Act 17-218, which became effective after the submission date of this petition.
- b) The Petitioner responded to what it claimed were DoAg's unsupported scientific assertions regarding impacts to future agricultural productivity and soil impacts.
- c) The Petitioner objected to DoAg's assertion that other developments would be better suited for the site.

DoAg did not respond."

Melanie A. Bachman November 27, 2017 Page 3

Finally, the Petitioner requests that the Council revisit Finding of Fact Number 200. As written, the mere numerical depiction fails to reflect the avoidance and minimization strategies employed by the Project to reduce the environmental impact through reuse of previously impacted land.

Thank you for your consideration. Please feel free to contact me if you have any questions regarding this correspondence.

Sincerely,

David W. Bogan

DWB

CERTIFICATION

I hereby certify that on November 27, 2017, the foregoing was delivered by electronic mail and regular mail, postage prepaid, in accordance with § 16-50j-12 of the Regulations of Connecticut State Agencies, to all parties and intervenors of record, as follows:

Troy and Megan Sposato 192 Wauregan Road Canterbury, CT 06331 megsposato@yahoo.com

David W. Bogan

Commissioner of the Superior Court